1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	TOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
11	Plaintiff, No. CR 14-00306 WHA
12	v.
4.0	
13	LUKE D. BRUGNARA, REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
13 14	LUKE D. BRUGNARA, Defendant. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
14 15	
14 15 16	
14 15 16 17	Defendant/
14 15 16 17 18	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be
14 15 16 17 18 19	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the trial date for July 6, AND overrules all of defendant's objections regarding an earlier trial date.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the trial date for July 6, AND overrules all of defendant's objections regarding an earlier trial date, why would this not moot out the main point of contention between defense counsel and their
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the trial date for July 6, AND overrules all of defendant's objections regarding an earlier trial date, why would this not moot out the main point of contention between defense counsel and their client, such that defense counsel could continue in our case?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Defendant. (1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the trial date for July 6, AND overrules all of defendant's objections regarding an earlier trial date, why would this not moot out the main point of contention between defense counsel and their client, such that defense counsel could continue in our case? (2) What is the status of the superseding indictment?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(1) If the Court makes an express finding that time up until July 6, 2015, should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act for effective preparation of counsel, AND firmly sets the trial date for July 6, AND overrules all of defendant's objections regarding an earlier trial date, why would this not moot out the main point of contention between defense counsel and their client, such that defense counsel could continue in our case? (2) What is the status of the superseding indictment? The parties are requested to respond by NOON ON MARCH 11, 2015. Defense counsel

Dated: March 9, 2015.

26

27

28

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE